```
(Telephonic proceedings on the record.)
 1
 2
              THE CLERK: 20 CR 257, United States of America versus
 3
    Amber Peltzer for a detention hearing.
 4
             THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon. Let's get
 5
     appearances of counsel, first the United States and --
 6
             MR. BERRY: Good afternoon.
 7
             THE COURT: -- then defendant and then pretrial
 8
    services.
 9
             MR. BERRY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Albert Berry,
    B-e-r-r-y, for the United States.
10
11
             MR. NASH: Michael Nash, N-a-s-h, for Amber Peltzer.
12
             THE DEFENDANT: Amber --
13
             MR. SCHROEDER: Sam Schroeder.
14
             THE DEFENDANT: Oh, sorry.
15
             MR. SCHROEDER: Sam Schroeder, pretrial services, Your
16
    Honor.
17
             THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon, counsel.
18
             Ms. Peltzer, you're on the line as well?
19
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
20
             THE COURT: Okay. Are you agreeing to participate in
21
     this hearing by telephone as opposed to in person? Because of
22
     the COVID-19 pandemic, we're giving people that opportunity if
23
     they agree to do so.
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
25
             THE COURT: Okay. We're here for a detention hearing
```

```
in Ms. Peltzer's case. Go ahead.
 1
 2
             MR. NASH: Can we find out where she's at?
 3
             THE COURT: All right. Where are you currently in
 4
     custody, Ms. Peltzer?
 5
             THE DEFENDANT: Oh, I can't hear you. What did you
 6
     say, sir?
 7
              THE COURT: Where are you currently in custody?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: I'm in the MCC building on Van Buren.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay. Did everybody get the pretrial
10
     services report from Mr. Schroeder?
11
             MR. BERRY: The Government has, Your Honor.
12
             MR. NASH:
                        I did.
13
             THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Berry, did you say you had it?
14
             MR. BERRY: I have it, Your Honor, yes, both the
15
     original and the addendum.
16
             THE COURT: Okay. I'm looking at the --
17
             MR. SCHROEDER: The original, Your Honor, was
18
     submitted on June 30th. The original was just a criminal
19
    history.
20
             THE COURT: Got it. Okay. I have both of them.
21
             All right. What's the United States' position here?
22
             MR. BERRY: Your Honor, we are seeking detention in
23
     this matter more for risk of flight but also for danger to the
24
     community. I'll just briefly go through some of the factors
25
     that are outlined in section 3142(q) of the United States Code.
```

With regard to the nature and circumstances of the offense, this offense happened in the early morning hours of May 31st, 2020. On May 30th, 2020, there was some protests following the murder of George Floyd, and those protests took place in Chicago. They went into the night, and early into the morning they kind of devolved into what we call civil unrest. There was some problems that went down and some looting that took place.

CPD was out there, and when they were in the area of 16th and Michigan they were driving an unmarked vehicle and saw Ms. Peltzer kind of in the doorway of an area. To them, they believed that she was kind of hiding, peering out of the doorway. They made a U-turn and came back to investigate.

As they were walking back towards the area where they saw her, a civilian from the second floor of the building was on the terrace and told them that the person in the red car had a firearm. According to the officers, there was only one red car on the block. They looked towards that red car, and Ms. Peltzer was in the driver's seat. She was the only occupant of the vehicle, and at that point she was reaching towards the passenger's seat as the officers walked towards the car.

Once they got there, one officer could see inside the window of the car, and on the passenger's seat he sees a firearm and a purse that belonged to Ms. Peltzer. Ms. Peltzer

was arrested as being a felon in possession of a firearm at that point.

Your Honor, that's the facts and circumstances of the case. I'm going to talk about the history of Ms. Peltzer. She does have a long criminal history. She has felonies, a robbery, an aggravated robbery with a firearm, felonies for theft. There's also, it looks like, some open cases that we have. There's an open case in Will County for ID theft. There's an open case in Oak Brook for burglary. The open case in Will County, there's a complaint and there's actually a warrant that's out for her arrest for that one. She also has an open case in St. John, Indiana for resisting. That's a felony in Indiana.

Ms. Peltzer has a criminal history out of Cook County in Illinois and a criminal history out of Indiana for the theft. Well, it was actually a robbery that was pled down to a theft. She also has a criminal history out of Florida, and it looks like she's on probation at the moment. So she's committed the offense while she was on probation in a different jurisdiction.

Also, Your Honor, in looking at her criminal history that was provided by pretrial, there are a number of bond forfeitures out of state. There's also warrants and violations of probation. With all of that said, Your Honor, it's the Government's position that Ms. Peltzer is a risk of flight.

Also, as I said, there's active warrants for her. So with these crimes that she's been convicted of in such a short period of time and the open cases that she has, if she's released into the community (inaudible) a danger to the community. There's a danger of committing more crimes, you know, possibly identification theft which is what (inaudible).

I'd also like to mention that the car that Ms. Peltzer was found in, there's an investigation going on there. The license plate, the temporary plate that was on the back of the car came back to another individual who informed ATF that he actually had his car in his driveway and that he had recently been the victim of identity theft.

So that's the Government's position at this time.

THE COURT: Where do you think she's going to flee to?

MR. BERRY: Well, Your Honor, it's not a -- well, what

I should say is it's a matter of where she will be and whether

she will appear in court. So I don't know it actually says,

you know, a likelihood to flee, but it's actually more or less

in this case a likelihood to not appear in court. In her

criminal history, her history shows that she does not appear in

court when she's directed to.

There's also a -- I understand that she says she's been a resident of Chicago her whole life, the Chicagoland area her whole life. But with the crime history in Chicago, in Illinois, Indiana, and Florida, it seems like there's some kind

of connection to Indiana at the very least, which is out of the state, and also there's a connection in Florida which she has technically violated her probation on.

THE COURT: Well, just to be clear, under the statute this is a firearm, a felon in possession of a firearm. So under 3142(f)(1)(e), I think, you know, there's at least a detention hearing that you get. So you're not -- you don't have to prove up a serious risk of flight. You have to prove up risk of non-appearance, I think, under the statute. But you had used the term "serious risk of flight," so I was wondering where --

MR. BERRY: I apologize, Your Honor. It is a risk of non-appearance. I used the wrong terminology.

THE COURT: So what you're saying essentially is that there's a lot of recent criminal history -- and, you know, for "recent" I'm going back to 2018 -- in three states or at least, you know, one conviction and arrests in essentially three states and multiple jurisdictions. So she is engaging in risky conduct, and there's a risk that this conduct continues and that she won't appear in these proceedings to defend the case, is that right? Is that what you're saying on risk of non-appearance?

MR. BERRY: Yes, as far as the risk of non-appearance, and also with the fact that her history shows that she has bond forfeiture warrants and violations of probation which show that

1 she does not listen to court orders or does not obey orders by 2 the court very well. 3 THE COURT: And the danger to the community? 4 MR. BERRY: The danger to the community part, Your 5 Honor, it's my understanding or my belief that when we talk 6 about danger to the community, people always believe we're 7 talking about violence. In this case, though she does have the 8 robbery, I think the danger to the community comes more in the 9 form of theft. That seems to be the history of this defendant. 10 She has a theft conviction, a misuse of credit card conviction. 11 She has a warrant out for burglary, and she also has a warrant 12 out for identification theft. 13 THE DEFENDANT: No. 14 MR. BERRY: Releasing her to the community puts people 15 in jeopardy financially in this case, it seems, more than 16 physically. 17 THE COURT: But I think you said at the outset you're 18 mostly arguing risk of non-appearance, correct? 19 MR. BERRY: That's correct, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. I'll hear from Mr. Nash. 21 Is Ms. Peltzer's mom, Celeste Peltzer, on the line? 22 MR. NASH: Judge, she is not. Judge, she has three 23 small children, and it's impossible for her to deal with what's

going on and take care of them. I just got off the phone with

2.4

25

her.

Judge, if I could, on the pretrial services report, if you look at page 6 --

THE COURT: Okay. In the addendum or in the original?

MR. NASH: You know what? I don't know which is
which, and I'm not sure which one I'm talking about. I don't

THE COURT: Page 6, page 6 of the addendum has the risks of non-appearance and assessment of danger. Page 6 of the other one has a Will County case from 2013.

MR. NASH: The Will County case.

THE COURT: Okay.

know that I --

MR. NASH: If you look down, it says it's on 3/25/14. This defendant was incarcerated in the state of Indiana, no bond, warrant issued. So a violation of the bond for her failure to appear when she's in jail in Indiana, that shouldn't be, and it shouldn't be a mark against her. It wasn't her fault she wasn't there. She just failed to appear because she's incarcerated in Indiana.

When I look at this record, it seems to me she's always going to court. She's got several cases, and I talked to the -- her mother talked to the prosecutor in the case that's up tomorrow in Indiana, and that prosecutor said if she doesn't show up they're going to continue it till a week from Friday, but if she doesn't show up a week from tomorrow in the Indiana case they're going to forfeit the bond and have a

warrant issued even if she's in the custody of the federal court, which indicates to me that this claim that she never shows up is not accurate.

Then there's a charge on the next day -- on the next page, and it says "theft, receiving stolen property, outcome unknown."

In Key West, the Key West case, she gets 12 months probation on October -- on January 1st, 2020, but that's basically a traffic charge, Judge, not -- I mean, there was damage to property but nothing else.

She lives in the south suburbs in Lansing, Illinois, with her mother, her father, her son, and her brother's two children, and she would be welcomed there. She has a detainer on her because of a case in Will County, but Mrs. Celeste Peltzer, her mother, went to Will County yesterday to post that bond. She had the cash, the thousand dollars to post bond, and they won't accept the bond without her being present.

So you have these small charges, but she appears. She's got a place where she can stay. She's got a family that cares for her. She's got a son, an eight-year-old son there who is just learning to get acquainted with his mother after her release from jail. There's no chance she's not going to appear here. Even the guidelines say the sentence is, I think, 37 to 40-something months, so it's not a long prison term.

Then as far as the offense itself, the prosecutor

car.

mentioned that the officers saw somebody on the landing of a building who said that the person who did it is in a red car. Well, I have the police report that the Government gave me, and there's no mention of that in there. They say that they saw somebody in an entryway. They went past and came back, and the person wasn't there. They went up to a car that was on the street, and she was in there. That's how they arrested her. It doesn't say anything about anybody directing them to the

Ms. Peltzer has also told me that she's been -- that she has cooperated with local authorities who are investigating the crime of postal theft with a key to post office boxes.

Mr. Berry and I tried to track that down beforehand, but we were not able to.

So I think that she's a good risk that she'll appear. Her mother will be her custodian and is willing to do that. So we're better off with her at home under electronic monitoring, and she'll be in court when she's supposed to be and anyplace else she's supposed to be.

THE COURT: I have some questions here. So first,

Mr. Berry, in terms of the nature of the crime, I didn't follow
everything you were saying. I was writing it down. You were
telling me in the early morning hours of May 31 the protests
devolved into civil unrest at 16th and Michigan. Then you said
there's a person in the doorway. Then there's Ms. Peltzer in

the car.

Could you give me the description that you were saying one more time? I don't understand how the person in the doorway relates to Ms. Peltzer. I do know that you say she was arrested as she was in a car with a firearm. So that's in proximity to a firearm, but what was the business about being in the doorway?

MR. BERRY: Yes, Your Honor. According to the officers, as they were riding down the street observing what was going on, they saw Ms. Peltzer in the doorway of an area kind of — from what they said, they believed her to be peering out, kind of looking out of the doorway. They turned back around to investigate, made a U-turn, and I left this part out so I apologize. They actually went past the door, saw that there was broken glass in the doorway, and then they went to go try to find Ms. Peltzer to investigate further. As they were looking for Ms. Peltzer, that's when they were told by the civilian that the person in the red car had a gun.

THE COURT: So when they went to the red car,

Ms. Peltzer was in the red car. Is that what you're telling

me?

MR. BERRY: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And what she's being charged with here has nothing to do with broken glass. It's being a felon in possession of a firearm which they found on her in the car.

MR. BERRY: That's correct. So with that, there was a 1 2 charge in the state for theft of property. They did recover 3 what they believed to be some jewelry that they believed to be 4 There's no federal charge for that, so I did not 5 mention that. I am now, but we didn't charge that. We don't 6 have a charge for that. 7 THE COURT: And, Mr. Nash, Ms. Peltzer has an 8 eight-year-old son who's right now living at home with her 9 parents, correct? 10 MR. NASH: Yes. 11 THE COURT: And you said that her mom has other young 12 children there. How many young children? 13 Three all together. I don't know the ages MR. NASH: 14 of the other two, but listening to them in the background I'm 15 quessing they're younger than eight years old. 16 THE COURT: And these are Celeste Peltzer's kids or 17 people who she's watching kids for? 18 MR. NASH: No, it's Celeste Peltzer's children. 19 Am I correct with that, Ms. Peltzer? 20 THE DEFENDANT: They are four and two. 21 MR. NASH: Yeah, that sounds about right. I've got a 22 three-year-old and a one-year-old in my house, and I know how 23 they sound. 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. It's my son, and then they're 25 four and two.

1	THE COURT: And those are your mom's other kids or
2	kids of someone else?
3	THE DEFENDANT: No, those are my mom's
4	THE COURT: That's your brother's kids?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
6	THE COURT: And your brother lives there, too, right?
7	THE DEFENDANT: He was on and off. He was going
8	through a divorce, so he's there back and forth.
9	THE COURT: So your mom is responsible for the
10	four-year-old and two-year-old most of the time.
11	THE DEFENDANT: 90 or like 95 percent of the time,
12	yes.
13	THE COURT: All right. I'm looking and I'm trying to
14	make my way through the criminal history here. So, Mr. Berry,
15	Ms. Peltzer was incarcerated in Indiana or in IDOC?
16	MR. BERRY: It looks like she was incarcerated in
17	Indiana, Your Honor. No, actually prior to
18	THE COURT: She was in IDOC for five years, or she was
19	sentenced to that, right?
20	MR. BERRY: She was in both. She was incarcerated in
21	Indiana. In Indiana, she received a sentence of probation for
22	that theft, and then she was violated on that and incarcerated
23	in Indiana while the Illinois Will County robbery case was
24	going on. That's the bond forfeiture that Mr. Nash was
25	speaking about. After her incarceration in Indiana, she then

```
1
     came back to Illinois, pled guilty to the aggravated robbery,
 2
     and received five years and had been since that time in the
 3
     Illinois Department of Corrections.
 4
              THE COURT: And when does she -- pretrial services
 5
     doesn't indicate, Mr. Schroeder, when she's released from IDOC.
 6
              MR. SCHROEDER:
                              It does not, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Do you know when she was released?
 8
              MR. NASH: Can I cut to the chase, Judge?
 9
              THE COURT: Well, you can cut to whatever chase you
10
    want, but I have a question. I want to know how much before
11
     she was picked up in Key West on October 27th, 2018, she was
12
     released from IDOC on her sentence on 10/31/2014.
13
              If Ms. Peltzer knows, you can tell me.
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I was released May 1st of 2018,
15
    my IDOC. It's for a reckless driving ticket in Key West.
16
    That's what I got probation for. It was a speeding ticket.
17
    was going too fast, and they gave me probation for it.
18
              MR. BERRY: Your Honor --
19
              THE COURT: But IDOC is for armed robbery, right?
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it was.
21
              MR. BERRY: Your Honor, I have a movement --
22
              MR. NASH:
                         I would say, Judge, according to the
23
    pretrial services report at page 4, it says no firearm, armed
24
    robbery, dash, no firearm.
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, it's --
```

```
THE COURT: Oh, no firearm, I see. I see.
 1
 2
              MR. BERRY: Your Honor, this is AUSA Albert Berry.
                                                                  Ι
 3
    had gotten an email from the Illinois Department of
 4
     Corrections. According to their movement sheet, it looks like
 5
     she was paroled on May 11th of 2018 and discharged from parole
 6
     on May 12th of 2020. So she was just discharged from parole
 7
    before she picked up this charge, about two weeks off on
 8
    parole.
 9
              THE COURT: And while she's on parole, she picks up a
10
     reckless driving in Key West, a resisting law enforcement and
11
    other things in Indiana, a Lake County possession of marijuana,
12
     then an identity theft in Will County, and then this charge on
13
    May 31st, right?
14
              MR. BERRY: That's correct, Your Honor.
15
                         I don't see the identity theft case.
              MR. NASH:
16
              THE COURT: That's in the supplement. That's in the
17
     addendum that we received today.
18
              MR. NASH: I haven't seen that.
19
              THE COURT: It's on page 5 of the addendum.
20
                         I don't have that.
              MR. NASH:
21
              THE COURT: Well, it's on the docket. It's Will
22
     County Superior Court case number 2020 --
23
          (Discussion off the record.)
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, Your Honor. Does it matter
25
     that when I had warrants I voluntarily turned myself in when I
```

1 found out I had them and posted my bond? 2 MR. NASH: It does say that on the report. 3 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 4 MR. NASH: But I haven't seen the supplemental report. 5 It may be on the docket sheet, but if you can get --6 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Nash, this is pretrial. 7 MR. NASH: Yes? 8 MR. SCHROEDER: On the 8th, I emailed you the 9 supplemental report along with Mr. Berry. 10 MR. NASH: Oh, maybe I do have it. 11 THE COURT: Check your email. 12 Ms. Peltzer, when you're saying that when you found 13 out you had warrants you turned yourself in, I actually am not 14 sure I see that on the docket sheet. 15 Mr. Schroeder, can you tell me -- I mean on the 16 pretrial, where is that on the pretrial? 17 MR. SCHROEDER: I'll have to look for it, Your Honor. 18 I don't know off the top of my head. Give me a second. 19 THE COURT: I actually don't see it. 20 Ms. Peltzer, when do you think you turned yourself in? 21 When do you say you turned yourself in? 22 THE DEFENDANT: It was right after I caught the 23 fleeing case in Indiana. The next week when Indiana told me 24 that I had warrants in DuPage for retail theft, my mom sent me 25 to the police station, and then I missed my -- I had a speeding

```
1
             I went to the police department and turned myself in
 2
     and posted my bond. It was like a 30-minute process, but I
 3
    voluntarily went to the police station and posted 7500 to get
 4
          It was right after Indiana because Indiana told me I had
 5
    warrants in DuPage for the retail theft. Then the next week,
 6
    my parents got the bond money together. But they weren't
 7
    extraditable, which is why they didn't make me go from state to
 8
            I went to the police department, the Oak Brook Police
 9
    Department, and voluntarily turned myself in, and I was there
10
     for 30 minutes and let back out.
11
              THE COURT: Well, what the docket sheet says -- what
12
     the pretrial services report says as of yesterday for the Will
13
     County identity theft for 2,000 to $10,000, it says:
14
              "Defendant has not appeared in this matter, active
15
    warrant."
16
              THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, Your Honor. It was the
17
     DuPage case, not Will County.
18
              THE COURT: Is DuPage Oak Brook?
19
              THE DEFENDANT: Where we posted? Yeah, it's Oak
20
    Brook.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
22
              MR. NASH: And Ms. Peltzer's mother went yesterday to
23
    post a bond for that. The Will County one, they wouldn't
24
    accept it.
25
          (Brief pause.)
```

THE COURT: And you're not — the pretrial services report says you currently do not have a job and you've been unemployed since November of 2018.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I do hair in my house, but it's not like a regular job. So I just do people's hair here and there, like coloring and stuff like that. But it's not like a real job at a place, so no. I mean, I can get one.

THE COURT: So it looks like since being released from IDOC in May of '18 you have in addition to this case -- well, including this case, you have one, two, three, four, five cases pending either in Indiana or in Illinois, including here in federal court, and you have -- while you're on probation in Florida for the reckless driving, right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, but I go to all my court dates.

THE COURT: Yes, I know. You may go to all your court dates, I mean, but you have -- and you're charged. You're not convicted of these other five cases, but it looks like a tremendous amount. I mean, it's like a one-woman crime spree here. I mean, you're charged in a number of different cases, some felonies, some misdemeanors, which is tremendously at the very least erratic conduct. I don't know what is going on in your life. I'm glad you're living with your parents. I'm glad you've living with your son.

Pretrial services recommends against any release here.

1 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Let me finish here. I think I would consider home incarceration in this case, which I think would be beneficial to you, frankly, to keep you off the streets in different states while these cases resolve. In order to do that, I would have to talk to your mom to see whether or not — I mean, I think she indicated that she was willing to have you go back and live there, obviously.

I don't know if it was that they talked about location monitoring or not, but I don't know why it is safe to the community or really why I'm assured that you will continue to appear here. Although I get that you're appearing in all these cases, but I'm not sure why you're picking up all these cases.

I'm not interested right now in engaging in a dialogue because a lot of times the lawyer doesn't necessarily want the client to engage in a dialogue like this. I would need to talk to your mother in any event. I can't tell here whether your mom — she works, it looks like, and so she's out of the house a great deal as well. I'm not sure who's in the house when she's out. She works nights, I guess, so maybe your dad.

THE DEFENDANT: My father.

THE COURT: What?

THE DEFENDANT: My father is there.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: My mother works nights, and my father

1 works days. So it's the opposite. I really got in all this 2 trouble because I got involved with a girl that I came from DOC 3 with, but she's currently incarcerated. So that's what my downfall was. 4 5 MR. NASH: We could get her on the phone, Judge. THE COURT: Well, I have a hearing at 4:00 that 6 7 they're calling in for. I guess what I would do, rather than 8 entering a ruling now, is continue the hearing to a time where 9 I can get her. I don't know if there's a time I can get both 10 Mr. and Mrs. Peltzer on the phone, but I'm --11 THE DEFENDANT: They're there now. My dad gets home 12 from work at 2:30. 13 THE COURT: And when does --14 THE DEFENDANT: My mom leaves for work at 6:00 p.m. or 15 around 6:00. 16 MR. NASH: I have no objection to continuing it, 17 Judge, to enable you to do that. I think that's most 18 reasonable. 19 THE COURT: I have -- tomorrow I have a hearing at 20 1:30. I could do this. So he gets home at 2:30. I could do 21 it at 3:00 p.m. tomorrow if the lawyers and pretrial are 22 available. 23 MR. BERRY: That's fine with the Government, Your 24 Honor.

MR. SCHROEDER: Pretrial will be able to be here, Your

25

```
1
    Honor.
 2
              MR. NASH: That's fine with me.
 3
              THE COURT: I'm going to -- for good cause on my own
 4
    motion, I'm going to continue this until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m.
 5
    We can get Ms. Peltzer back on with this kind of notice, right?
                         Yeah, I believe so.
 6
              THE CLERK:
 7
              THE COURT:
                         Brenda?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I'll do it right now.
 9
              THE COURT: Okay. I really want to explore it with
10
    Ms. Peltzer's parents. I need to hear from them because I
11
    think I need responsible people in her life right now.
12
              I hear that you're saying you were involved with
13
     somebody who you met in the Illinois Department of Corrections
14
     and that now she's back in but, you know, you're --
15
              THE DEFENDANT: She's actually the one I caught my
16
    DuPage case with.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. But you're 28 years old. You're an
18
    adult, and you have a mind of your own.
19
              THE DEFENDANT: I take responsibility.
20
              THE COURT: Yes, you have a mind of your own, too.
21
    mean, I recognize that at this time it's dangerous to be
22
     incarcerated pretrial or post-trial with COVID-19, so I really
23
     take that all into consideration in making these decisions.
2.4
    But I need --
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --
```

THE COURT: I am not prepared with this history to release you and say go out and just do whatever you want to do. I would think about releasing you on some strict conditions which would include home incarceration, but I would want to know that where I'm sending you is someplace that they're okay with that kind of condition under these circumstances. So I really want to explore that with your folks. Mr. Nash can talk to them beforehand. If for some reason 3:00 p.m. tomorrow doesn't work, Mr. Berry and Mr. Nash should call or email Brenda, my courtroom deputy, and we'll figure something out.

But I need to get more information than I have now. Right now I have somebody who's exhibiting a tremendous amount of instability and reckless and dangerous conduct. I get that, you know, you've gone to court and you've told them where you are and those are points in your favor, but I would want to see where I would be releasing you to if I'm going to do that.

I have a recommendation from pretrial services who did talk to your parents, at least your mom, saying that there are no conditions that would reasonably assure that you would continue to appear. I'll make my own decision on this. I trust pretrial services. I value their recommendations, but I also want to do my own due diligence on this. So if we can get together tomorrow at 3:00 p.m. so that I can get some more information, that would be my preference.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: I'll continue the case until then, and
2	hopefully we can reconvene and make some more progress.
3	MR. BERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Okay.
6	MR. NASH: Thank you, Judge.
7	THE COURT: Yes. Bye-bye.
8	(Proceedings concluded.)
9	CERTIFICATE
10	I, Patrick J. Mullen, do hereby certify the foregoing
11	is an accurate transcript produced from an audio recording of
12	the proceedings had in the above-entitled case before the
13	Honorable JEFFREY T. GILBERT, one of the magistrate judges of
14	said court, at Chicago, Illinois, on July 9, 2020.
15	
16	<i>/s/ Patrick J. Mullen</i> Official Court Reporter
17	United States District Court Northern District of Illinois
18	Eastern Division
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	